

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/057,523	01/22/2002	George M. White	2222.0820005	5053	
26111 STERNE KES	7590 04/22/201 SSLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1100 NEW YO	ORK AVENUE, N.W.	LERNER, MARTIN			
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/057,523	WHITE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MARTIN LERNER	2626		

	MARTIN LERNER	2626						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (2) a Notice of Application (3) and (4) application (4) appli	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.131; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of a fine file. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (a) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two month	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 								
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		cted claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xpianation of					
Claim(s) objected to:	4.00							
Claim(s) rejected: 59, 61 to 66, 68 to 73, 75 to 79, 81, and Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>163</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 3. Other:								
/Martin Lerner/								
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2626						

Continuation of 3 NOTE:

Applicants' amendment considerably broadens the claims in some aspects and narrows the claims for the new limitations directed to a high bandwidth communication channel and a low bandwidth communication channel so as to present substantiality extenses the consideration. Specifically, it is appreciated that Applicants may believe that the current claims were amended so as to follow allowable subject matter identified during a telephone interview for the co-pending (now allowed) application, where the claims in the co-pending application were allowed due to a combination of all the elements there claimed, and the current claims are considerably broadened by the amendments deleteing the limitations directed to updating or modifying the keyword detection and updating the previously stored accoustic models. A preliminary search of the new limitations of a high bandwidth communication channel discovered, e.g., Odinak (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,748), which discloses transmitting simple control information by iow data bandwidth channels and transmitting audio and video over high bandwidth channels for a home automation system. (Column 2, Lines 15 to 25). Applicants have amended the independent claims in a manner so that they now only require a distributed speech recognition system. Total are a recognized with an acoustic model. Without the limitations directed to modifying or updating keywords or acoustic models, it is maintained that prior art could be found that discloses these features of a distributed speech recognition system. Thus, it is likely that it would be a simple combination for references to reject the independent claims as amended. Therefore, Applicants' amendments raise new issues requiring further search and consideration due to the broadening nature of these amendments.